The grammaticalization of manner expressions into complementizers or quotatives

Caroline Gentens & Kasper Boye
(University of Stockholm & University of Copenhagen)

Saxena (1995) drew attention to the cross-linguistic polyfunctionality and grammaticalization of manner deictics such as *thus* or *so* into complementizers or quotative markers. She suggested a pathway of development along which manner expressions first develop a function as quotative markers, which then gives them the potential to acquire the same range of functions as verbs of speaking that grammaticalized into complementizers. Saxena further proposes that this development proceeds unidirectionally along the following implicational hierarchy (including other functional extensions of manner expressions):

(1)   (manner expression <) direct quote marker, complementizer < purpose, reason marker < conditional marker < comparative marker

In later work, the specific aptitude for manner expressions to develop into quotatives as in (2) or complementizers as in (3) has been confirmed to be widespread (Heine & Kuteva 2002: 274, 258; Güldemann 2008: 317-328; König 2015; Boye & Kehayov 2016; Treis & Vanhove 2017). These studies show that the quotative stage posited in (1) is not a necessary part of the development, and that similar developments into the domain of complex sentences apply to manner demonstratives (e.g. *so*), manner question words (e.g. *how*), manner nouns (e.g. *way*), manner affixes, and to closely related similative verbs (e.g. *resemble*) or similative prepositions (e.g. *like*), which we therefore all include under our umbrella term of 'manner expressions'.

(2)   *For so seyde Salomon, þe wise: "Þe mon þat her wel deþ, he cumeþ þar he lyen foþ on his lynes ende"*
        'For so said Salomon the wise: "The man who does well here, he obtains recompense at his life's end."' (cataphoric quotative marker, OED, Middle English)
(3)   *He told me <u>how</u> (≈ that, ≠ the manner in which) John might never return to his home country.*

The grammaticalization of manner expression remains understudied, however. This has been attributed to their semantic and syntactic versatility (e.g. König 2015: 39-40), and to the problems associated with making more fine-grained distinctions between markers of manner 'proper', similarity, comparison, instrument, and means (Kortmann 1997: 81, 84, 146; Hengeveld & Mackenzie 2008: 263-265). In this workshop, we want to draw on the recent surge in relevant descriptive studies to refine existing distinctive criteria, to document the

ways in which manner expressions acquire grammatical functions in complex sentences, and to examine their relevance to the cross-linguistic study of the semantics of complementation.

This last question relates to the functional specialization of the resulting expression that introduces a complement clause in the broad sense. Some grammaticalized manner expressions are specialized for non-presupposed complement types in the domain of direct and indirect speech and thought reporting, for instance into quotative, i.e. direct speech-related, uses (e.g. *so* in (2) and *be like*), or into indirect speech-related uses (e.g. *so* as a propositional anaphor in *He said so*). Others specialize for so-called presupposed, 'factive', propositions (e.g. *how* in (3)) rather than illocutions (Gentens 2016, Legate 2010, Nye 2013, Boye & Kehayov 2016). Yet another type occurs specifically with counterfactual (CTRFCT), so-called 'mistaken belief' complements as in (4) (e.g. Evans 1995, 2003). We would like the participants of the workshop to explore the question of how the different specializations relate to each other - in terms of areal distribution, possible mutual exclusiveness, and/or traces of semantic or syntactic persistence with respect to the source construction.

(4)   niya   nguthaliya-th,   maraka   kalka-th   (Kayardild, Tangkic)
      3sgNOM   pretend-ACT(UAL)   CTRFCT   be sick-ACT(UAL)
      'He pretended he was sick.' Evans (1995: 379)

The goal of this workshop is thus to bring together papers documenting the synchronic and diachronic multifunctionality of manner expressions that have come to function as propositional complementizers or as quotatives, both in English and beyond. We would like the contributions to explore one or more of the following questions:

- which **empirical criteria**, tests, or markers allow you to distinguish between closely related uses of a manner expression (e.g. manner and similative uses) or between closely related complement types (e.g. between presupposed, interrogative, and exclamative *how*-complements, cf. Nye 2013)?
- how do different uses of the same marker relate to the distinction between **states of affairs**, **propositions**, and **illocutions** (see e.g. Vendler 1967: 122-146, Lyons 1977, Boye 2012)?
- which **semantic specialization** does the element introducing a complement clause have? Does it specialize for so-called '**factive**' propositions as in (3), or rather for non-presupposed complements in the **directly and indirectly reported domain** (cf. *so* in (2)), or more specifically for counterfactual, so-called '**mistaken belief**' contexts (e.g. the marker roughly paraphrasable as *as if* in (4))?
- does this semantic specialization show in a restriction on the set of **main clause predicates** the complement type co-occurs with? Is the marker also used in cases of (semi-)**insubordination**?
- how does this semantic clause type relate to the larger **system of complementation** in the language?

- which **source construction(s)/mechanism(s) of change** underlie the development of the complementizer/quotative use? Which other uses does the marker have outside of the domain of complex sentences?

References

Boye, Kasper (2012), *Epistemic Meaning*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Boye, Kasper & Peter Kehayov (eds) (2016), *Complementizer Semantics in European Languages*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Evans, Nicholas (1995), *A Grammar of Kayardild*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Evans, Nicholas (2003), *Bininj Gun-wok: A Pandialectal Grammar of Mayali, Kunwinjku and Kune*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Gentens, Caroline (2016), The factive-reported distinction in English. Representational and interpersonal semantics. PhD thesis, University of Leuven.

Güldemann, Tom (2008), *Quotative Indexes in African Languages*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Heine, Bernd & Tania Kuteva (2002), *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: CUP.

Hengeveld, Kees & J. Lachlan Mackenzie (2008), Functional Discourse Grammar. Oxford: OUP.

König, Ekkehard (2015), Manner deixis as source of grammatical markers in Indo-European languages. In Carlotta Viti (ed.), *Perspectives on historical syntax*, 33-60. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kortmann, Bernd (1997), *Adverbial Subordination*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Legate, Julie (2010), On how *how* is used instead of *that*. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 28: 121–134.

Lyons, John (1977), *Semantics*, vol. II. Cambridge: CUP.

Nye, Rachel (2013), *How complement clauses distribute: complementiser how and the case against clause-type*. PhD thesis, University of Ghent.

Saxena, Anju (1995), Unidirectional grammaticalization: Diachronic and cross-linguistic evidence. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung (STUF)* 48(4): 350–372.

Vendler, Zeno (1967), Facts and Events. In Zeno Vendler (ed.), *Linguistics in philosophy*, 122–146. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Treis, Yvonne & Martine Vanhove (2017), *Similative and equative constructions. A cross-linguistic perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.